REMARKS

Claim 36 has been amended to correct a typographical punctuation error. This change does not affect the scope of the claim and is not in response to any rejection or objection.

Claims 39 and 53 have been amended to correct a minor technical error. This change does not affect the scope of the claims and is not in response to any rejection or objection.

Claim Objections

Claims 26, 27, 28, 33, 46, 48, and 53 are objected to as allegedly lacking line indentations. This objection is respectfully traversed. Firstly, 37 CFR 1.75(I) contains the word "should" rather than "shall" or "must" and is therefore not mandatory. Secondly, the elements here are indented, with bullets. The rule does not specify any particular type of indentation and therefore does not preclude bullets.

Claims 35, 43, 49, and 55 have been amended as required by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully submits that these changes are stylistic in nature and do not narrow the claims. These amendments therefore should not result in any filewrapper estoppel.

Art rejections

The art rejections are respectfully traversed.

Since the references are complex and several, Applicant will confine his remarks to those portions cited by the Examiner, except as otherwise indicated. Applicant makes no representation as to the contents of other portions of the references.

Any of the Examiner's rejections and/or points of argument that are not addressed below would appear to be moot in view of the following. Nevertheless, Applicant reserves the right to

respond to those rejections and arguments and to advance additional arguments at a later date. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

Claims 26 and 29

These claims further recite that coordination of power and cooling is responsive to an actuation indication for **switching** on or **switching** off the lamp. This limitation therefore requires some kind of sensing of actuation of a switch. New claims 65 and 66 have been added to further emphasize this point.

In both references, cooling appears to be responsive either to sensed temperature (Hirao) or to a sensed loss of power (Billington). Billington does talk about gradually cooling down after turning off, but there is no teaching or suggestion that the apparatus would do anything different in that case than with loss of mains power. Applicants do not see where there is any teaching or suggestion of coordination of power and cooling responsive to an actuation indication for switching on or off the lamp.

Applicants accordingly respectfully submit that the office action fails to present a *prima facie* case against these references.

Claim 27, 32

Claim 27 recites that the control signals specify a first plurality of stepwise intermediate values for cooling and a second plurality of stepwise intermediate values for power. The Examiner states that this is inevitable in a combination of the references. Applicants respectfully disagree.

REMARKS

In Hirao Fig. 5, Applicants see only two stepwise values V0 and V1, with any other values being continuous, not stepwise. Applicants do not see any teaching or suggestion of a plurality of stepwise intermediate values. Applicants do not see any stepwise values in Billington either – as the section pointed to by the Examiner states "gradually," which seems to imply continuous variation.

Applicants accordingly respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to make a *prima face* case against claim 27.

Claim 32 is similar to claim 27, but recites only cooling off.

Claim 44

Claim 44 is similar to claim 27, but recites that values are alternately or stepwise reduced. Stepwise reduction is addressed above, with respect to claim 27. The Examiner has pointed to no indication of alternate reduction in the reference, nor do Applicants see any such teaching or suggestion. Applicants accordingly respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* case against claim 44.

Claim 30 , 45, and 56-64 – ***STORED SWITCHING SCHEDULE***

Claim 30 is similar to claim 44, but also recites a stored switching schedule. The Examiner thinks that this is obvious from the references, but Applicants respectfully disagree. Any adjustment in the references seems to be in accordance with sensed values, not in accordance with a stored switching schedule. Applicants accordingly respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* case against this claim.

REMARKS

If the Examiner intends to persist in this rejection, he is respectfully requested to cite art illustrating why stored switching schedules would be obvious in this context.

Claims 45 is analogous to claim 30 in this respect.

New claims 56-64 recite further aspects of the stored switching schedule, none of which seems to be taught or suggested by the references, at least so far as Applicants currently understand the references.

Nakamura (claims 33, 39-42, 48, and 53)

With respect to these claims, the Examiner alleges that Nakamura's air pressure sensor 3 detects a parameter of the cooling device. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner mischaracterizes this reference. The sensor 3 is said to detect "outside air pressure" (per par. 0017, lines 4-6) while the cooling fan is said to be "inside the casing of the liquid crystal projector" (per par. 0018, lines 1-2). Applicants accordingly fail to see how the air pressure detector would detect a parameter of the cooling device. Instead, Nakamura's air pressure detector seems to be related to high altitude operation, per par. 0022, line 5. Applicants accordingly respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* case against these claims.

The Examiner also indicates that certain limitations of these claims are a matter of obvious design choice. Applicants respectfully disagree. If the Examiner intends to persist in this rejection, he is respectfully requested to find documentation illustrating such design choices.

REMARKS

Claims 36 and 50

These claims recite a trigger circuit. Applicants do not see where the Examiner has read this limitation on any reference. Applicants accordingly respectfully submit that the rejection of these claims fails to satisfy 37 CFR 1.104.

Parker

This reference is cited against claims 31, 37, 46, 50, and 51. It is not clear why the Examiner groups these claims together as their limitations seem to be quite distinct. Moreover, the limitations that the Examiner purports to find in Parker do not appear in all of the claims of this group. Applicants accordingly respectfully submit that these rejections fail to satisfy 37 CFR 1.104.

It should be noted that claim 51, for instance, has the trigger circuit participating both in input and output from the control unit. The Examiner fails to indicate where this is taught or suggested.

Please charge any fees other than the issue fee to deposit account 14-1270. Please credit any overpayments to the same account.

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully submit that they have addressed each issue raised by the Examiner — except for any that were skipped as moot — and that the application is accordingly in condition for allowance. Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Anne Barschall/
Anne E. Barschall, Reg. No. 31,089
Tel. no. 914-332-1019
Fax no. 914-332-7719
Date of printing: September 6, 2008

In house contact at assignee:
Christopher Ries
Reg. No. 45,799
Tel. # 914-945-6000